



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,146	03/25/2004	Gregg J. Palmer	112300-2103	8364
29159	7590	06/25/2009	EXAMINER	
K&L Gates LLP P.O. Box 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690			SAGER, MARK ALAN	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/25/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/810,146	Applicant(s) PALMER ET AL.
	Examiner M. Sager	Art Unit 3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **4/22/04, 4/27/06**.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) **1-59** is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) **1-59** is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date **4/22/04, 4/27/06**

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Claim Interpretation

1. Per MPEP 2111.04, claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure. However, examples of claim language, although not exhaustive, that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim are (A) “adapted to” or “adapted for” clauses, (B) “wherein” clauses, and (C) “whereby” clauses. The determination of whether each of these clauses is a limitation in a claim depends on the specific facts of the case. In *Hoffer v. Microsoft Corp.*, 405 F.3d 1326, 1329, 74 USPQ2d 1481, 1483 (Fed. Cir. 2005), the court held that when a “whereby” clause states a condition that is material to patentability, it cannot be ignored in order to change the substance of the invention.” *Id.* However, the court noted (quoting *Minton v. Nat'l Ass'n of Securities Dealers, Inc.*, 336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620 (Fed. Cir. 2003)) that a “whereby clause in a method claim is not given weight when it simply expresses the intended result of a process step positively recited.” *Id.*

2. Also, while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In *re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board's finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference); see also *In re Swinchart*, 439 F.2d 210, 212-13, 169 USPQ 226, 228-29 (CCPA 1971); *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). “[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does.” *Hewlett-*

Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original). Also, it is reiterated that a claim containing a “recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus” if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987) (The preamble of claim 1 recited that the apparatus was “for mixing flowing developer material” and the body of the claim recited “means for mixing ..., said mixing means being stationary and completely submerged in the developer material”. The claim was rejected over a reference that taught all the structural limitations of the claim for the intended use of mixing flowing developer. However, the mixer was only partially submerged in the developer material. The Board held that the amount of submersion is immaterial to the structure of the mixer and thus the claim was properly rejected.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 25-29, 32-34, 37-39, 42-45, 48-52 and 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As per decision of Bilski, any invention having a claimed method that is neither tied to another statutory category nor transforms underlying subject matter to another state or thing is non-statutory. The facts of this application coincide with the facts of *In re Bilski*, thus, this invention claims non-statutory subject matter. *Diamond v Diehr*, 450 USPQ2d 175, 184 (1981). *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed Cir 2008). See MPEP 2106. See

[http://ptoweb/patents/3700/documents/101.memo.01.07.09.pdf,](http://ptoweb/patents/3700/documents/101.memo.01.07.09.pdf)

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/precognitice/section_101_05_15_2008.pdf and

http://www.uspto.gov/wcb/offices/pac/dapp/opla/precognitice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-59 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6719632. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because method and gaming device claimed herein is the method and gaming device claimed therein for awarding a prize to player based on position moves.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 8-10, 22-24, 32-36 and 55-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamille (5855514). Kamille discloses gaming device and method with claimed steps and features (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19) including a game (figs 1-19), a display device (figs 1-19), a plurality of positions (figs 1-19), a plurality of awards (figs 7C), a plurality of positions moves (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19), a terminator (void), a processor operable with display to control the play of said game (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19), causing a selection of one of positions (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19), determining one of positions based on the selected position moves (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19), associating terminator with at least one positions moves (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19), forming an offer based on any award associated with determined position (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19), enabling player to accept or reject (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19, i.e. by happenstance of use, any player may decide to stop or continue play as stated therein at least until void occurs), providing offer to the player if player accepts offer (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19), repeat if player rejects offer until player accepts offer or terminator is associated with selected position [or determined position is associated with said terminator] (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19) where each position is based on selected position move and any previously selected position (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19), processor is operable to control player of the game by enabling player to select position moves (abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19, within construct/rules of game as

taught therein) and operating the gaming device through a network such as internet ((abstract, 3:59-4:3, 4:60-67, 5:32-11:25, figs 1-19, esp. 5:32-49).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Sager whose telephone number is 571-272-4454. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F, 0700-1730 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. Sager/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714